

Remarks

Claim 33 has been amended. Claims 1-32 and 34-38 were canceled. Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment and allowance of Claim 33, as amended, in view of these Remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 as amended includes allowable subject matter and, considered in view of these Remarks, is in condition for allowance. In the alternative, Applicants respectfully request issuance of an Advisory Action.

Claim 33 was rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Guedelia 6,536,043 in combination with Lobodzinski 5,619,995. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration of claim 33 as presently amended.

Claim 33, as amended, specifies:

“at least two streams of compressed digital video data streaming from a single field of view of a camera, each of the at least two streams of compressed digital video data representing continuous live video of the single field of view of the camera”.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's statement that Guedelia does not suggest the technique of displaying together on a client at least two streams of live continuous video. In the interest of precision, claim 33 has been amended, as indicated. Guedelia clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest the specified limitations. Accordingly, claim 33, as amended, is allowable over Guedelia.

Likewise, Geudalia does not disclose the new allowable subject matter added to claim 33, as amended. For example, Geudelia does not disclose, teach or suggest:

“compressing the digital video data to provide a low-resolution stream, the low-resolution stream having a respective low image resolution;

compressing the digital video data to provide a higher-resolution stream, the higher resolution stream having a respective higher image resolution, the low image resolution being less than the high image resolution;

encoding the low-resolution stream in a stream of multicast protocol low-resolution

data packets, each of the multicast protocol low-resolution data packets having a respective multicast header identifying a respective low-resolution multicast group address;

encoding the higher-resolution stream in a stream of multicast protocol higher-resolution data packets, each of the multicast protocol higher-resolution data packets having a respective multicast header identifying a respective higher-resolution multicast group address;

each client connecting to the low-resolution multicast group address;

each client connecting to the higher-resolution multicast group address;”

as specified in claim 33, as amended.

Similarly, Geudalia does not disclose, teach or suggest the following new subject matter specified in claim 33, as amended:

“displaying on each client a single image of the video from the higher-resolution stream, the higher-resolution stream being provided from the higher-resolution multicast group address”.

Likewise, Guedelia fails to disclose, teach or suggest:

“on each client performing at least one of the following actions:

displaying on the respective client a 2x2 array of the video from the higher-resolution stream, the higher-resolution stream being provided from the higher-resolution multicast group address;

displaying on the respective client a 3x3 array of the video from the low-resolution stream, the low-resolution stream being provided from the low-resolution multicast group address;

displaying on the respective client a 4x4 array of the video from the low-resolution stream, the higher-resolution stream being provided from the higher-resolution multicast group address.”

In view of the all of the preceding, claim 33 as amended is allowable over Guedelia.

Lobodzinski does not sure any of the above-referenced deficiencies of Guedelia.

First, in this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 has been amended to specify both:

“at least two streams of compressed digital video data streaming from a single field of view of a camera, each of the at least two streams of compressed digital video data representing continuous live video of the single field of view of the camera”
and

“compressing the digital video data to provide a low-resolution stream, the low-resolution stream having a respective low image resolution;

compressing the digital video data to provide a higher-resolution stream, the higher resolution stream having a respective higher image resolution, the low image resolution being less than the high image resolution;”.

Clearly, Lobodzinski fails to disclose, teach or suggest these limitations. Lobodzinski clearly does not suggest creating and displaying at least two different streams having different compressions and different resolutions of compressed digital video data representing continuous live video of the single field of view of the camera. FIG. 6 of Lobodzinski clearly is directed to displaying video streams from different cameras. Thus, Lobodzinski teaches away from the above-referenced limitations set forth in claim 33. Accordingly, Guedelia and Lobodzinski cannot be combined to reject claim 33. Also, even if combined, Guedelia and Lobodzinski fail to teach the above-referenced limitations of claim 33.

Applicants also respectfully submit that Lobodzinski clearly fails to teach:

“encoding the low-resolution stream in a stream of multicast protocol low-resolution data packets, each of the multicast protocol low-resolution data packets having a respective multicast header identifying a respective low-resolution multicast group address;

encoding the higher-resolution stream in a stream of multicast protocol higher-resolution data packets, each of the multicast protocol higher-resolution data packets having a respective multicast header identifying a respective higher-resolution multicast group address;

each client connecting to the low-resolution multicast group address;

each client connecting to the higher-resolution multicast group address;”.

Likewise, Lobodzinski clearly fails to teach displaying the at least two streams on each client

as specified in claim 33 as amended.

Applicants also renew the same traversals of Guedelia regarding claim 33 as set forth in the preceding response.

In view of the foregoing, claim 33 is allowable over the combined references. Applicants respectfully requests entry of a Notice of Allowance for claim 33. The requested amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal, and its entry is therefor respectfully solicited. If the Examiner has any other matters which pertain to this Application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to resolve these matters by Examiner's Amendment where possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to withdraw or credit any filing fees associated with this Response from Deposit Account No. 50-4128.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Hunt/

Jeffrey D. Hunt, Reg. 38,189

Date: December 10, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER 67589
MOORE LANDREY, L.L.P.
1609 Shoal Creek Blvd., Ste. 100
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: (512) 499-8900
Facsimile: (512) 320-8906